

May 15, 1969

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 4039

of the expenditure table \$2.8 billion for civilian and military pay increases. The Pentagon's share of that, for its employees in and out of uniform (the Pentagon employs nearly one-half of all the civilian employees in the government) is \$2.5 billion. When that additional pay item is added, the total for national defense is \$83 billion, or better then 56 cents of every dollar available. That is a third (actually 36%) more than the 41 cents shown in the first budget chart.<sup>2</sup>

At the same time, lumping the trust funds with the general revenues exaggerates the government's contributions to health and welfare. Johnson boasted that outlays for health and welfare in his 1970 budget would be \$55 billion, which is 28% of Federal outlays—more than double the level prevailing in 1964 when his War on Poverty was launched. But \$42.9 billion of this was to come from self-financed trust funds for retirement and social insurance and Medicare.<sup>3</sup> So almost four-fifths of this benevolent assistance was from the beneficiaries. Only the difference, \$12.1 billion, represents outlays from the general revenues. That is about 8%, not 28%.

While the government was to pay \$42.9 billion from these insurance and health trust funds, it would collect a total of \$45.8 billions in fiscal 1970, or almost \$3 billion more than it paid out. This addition to the surplus in the trust funds is, of course, anti-inflationary, for it cuts down purchasing power, but this is purchasing power at the bottom of the economic pyramid, taken from those least able to pay. Regarded as taxation, social security deductions from payroll represent a severely regressive—and, unlike so many income taxes, inescapable—form of taxation. I can remember, when social security legislation was first being drafted in the early days of the New Deal, writing editorials proposing—as did other liberals and radicals—that it be financed out of income taxes so as to create a more equitable distribution of wealth, taking funds from the top of the pyramid to ease poverty at the bottom. The Social Security system adopted, which we still have, essentially takes from the poor what it gives them, and gives less than it takes.

The Welfare System and the War on Poverty were admissions that social security was abysmally inadequate. But Johnson's War on Poverty was made to look far more extensive than it was, and Nixon's revisions use the same deceptive computations. "Our 1970 Revised Budget," says a Budget Bureau statement of April 14, "involves a 10% increase over FY '69 in spending for the poor" (italics in the original). This reflects our deep commitment to the underprivileged.<sup>4</sup> The Budget Bureau statement did not explain, however, that this also represented a cut of \$300 million in Johnson's poverty recommendations for fiscal 1970—nor that much of this bloated estimate is padded out with normal payments from social security.

<sup>2</sup>I can remember when a feature of the annual federal budget presentation was a chart showing how much was absorbed by past, present and future wars. This added military expenditures, veterans' benefits and interest charges, the last item because past wars are the real reason for the public debt. These three items in the 1970 budget total more than \$106 billion and will take more than 70% of the general revenues. Secretary Laird said the other day that much of the Soviet Union's space activity was really military. This is also true of our space program. The funds spent on rocket boosters to reach the moon also improve the technology of mass murder by intercontinental ballistic missile. If space is added to the other three items, the total is \$110 billion, or almost 75% of the \$147 billion available.

## HOW THE FIGURES ARE PADDED

Johnson claimed he would spend \$27.2 billion on "Federal Aid to the Poor". Nixon out of that "deep commitment" revised this downward to \$26.9 billion. The biggest item in Johnson's as in Nixon's, Federal Aid to The Poor compilation (at p. 47 of the main budget message volume) is \$13.5 billion for "income assistance." My curiosity was piqued by a discrepancy of almost \$10 billion between this item and a passage at pages 42-3 of the Budget in Brief. This said that Federally aided public welfare would in fiscal 1970 provide assistance to a monthly average of 10 million individuals at a total cost of \$7 billion. "The Federal share," it said, "was \$3.7 billion." When I asked the Budget Bureau where the rest of the claimed figure of \$13.5 billion came from, I got this compilation (in millions):

Administrative expenses	-----	\$600
Old age pensions	-----	6,300
R.R. retirement pensions	-----	400
Unemployment insurance	-----	500
Veterans' Administration	-----	2,100
Total	-----	9,900

<sup>3</sup>The Budget Bureau, when I asked what the Veterans' Administration had to do with the war on poverty, explained that 80% of veterans' pensions, 70% of veterans' survivors' pensions and 20% of other veterans' benefits had been counted as "Federal Aid to The Poor" in the Johnson table!

The figures given me were "rounded" and so the final totals do not quite match but this \$9.9 billion of "padding" explains how that \$3.7 billion in Federal welfare income assistance was made to look like \$13.5 billion.

It is fortunate that few people on welfare spend their spare time reading the Federal budget. It would foment riots. The Budget Bureau "press kit" for Nixon's revisions of the 1970 budget says these involve "hard choices" and are part of the Nixon Administration's "concern for the poor." Nixon added \$300 million for dependent children but squeezed \$200 million of this out of a projected increase in our pitifully low old age pensions. "For the aged," the same Budget Bureau explanation says, "a 7% social security cost-of-living increase is included in the revised 1970 budget." It does not explain that this is a revision downward from the 10% increase recommended by Johnson, nor that Nixon also shelved Johnson's proposal to increase the minimum from \$55 a month to \$80 a month. There are 2,000,000 Americans—believe it or not—now expected to enjoy retirement on \$55 a month! Instead of getting a \$35 raise to \$80 a month, they will only receive the general 7% increase, though I was told this would be "rounded off" so that instead of a mere \$3.85, they would get \$4 or \$5 a month more. This could bring them up to \$60 a month. Thanks to the Administration's concern for them, moreover, the revised legislation "includes liberalization of the social security retirement test" allowing them to earn more outside income without having it deducted from their pensions. The liberalization turns out to be \$120 a year, about \$2 a week<sup>5</sup> and raises the ceiling on allowed earning to \$36 a week! What a dolce vita!

Roughly a billion each was cut out of so-

<sup>5</sup>The liberalization will allow a maximum of \$1800 a year without deductions. By comparison retired professional military men (20 years service) are allowed under the Dual Compensation Act of 1964 to fill Civil Service jobs paying up to \$30,000 and still collect their full pensions, a privilege not given other veterans. Under the new pay raise this will mean retired army officers can draw up to \$50,000 a year in Civil Service pay and pensions.

cial security and out of the military budget by Nixon. This symmetry of sacrifice is deceptive. Before anyone starts dropping pennies into cups for the Pentagon, I would like to lift the curtain on another murky corner of the budget. To evaluate the Nixon military "economies" you have to go back for another look at the Johnson budget for 1970. This projected a drop of \$3.5 billion in the costs of our "Southeast Asia operations." This was to be our first dividend on the road to peace, the money to be saved principally by ending the bombing of the North. Johnson in making up his budget could have allocated this \$3.5 billion to welfare or to the rebuilding of the cities. Instead Johnson's budget allocated \$4.1 billion more to military spending *unconnected with the Vietnam war*. This accounts for the fact that in his 1970 budget the cost of national defense rose by more than half a billion dollars over 1969 despite the projected \$3.5 billion drop in the costs of the Vietnam war.

## A MONSTER AT THE HEAD OF THE TABLE

This favored treatment of the military machine has to be seen against the background of a figure revealed in the Nixon revisions. His revised budget estimates for fiscal 1969 which ends next June 30 discloses that \$7.3 billion had to be squeezed out of the normal civilian and welfare operations of the government in this fiscal year to meet the expenditure ceilings imposed by Congress as a condition for voting the 10% surtax. This squeeze over and above the original 1969 budget was made necessary by an unexpected rise in certain "uncontrollable" items exempt from mandatory ceilings. *The biggest uncontrollable item was the Vietnam war which cost \$3 billion more in fiscal 1969 than had been budgeted for it.* So all kinds of services were starved in 1969 to meet the swollen costs of Vietnam in fiscal '69. Yet when a \$3.5 billion drop in Vietnam war costs were projected for fiscal '70, the amount saved was not allocated to the depleted domestic sector but to the growth of the war machine.

Nixon's cut of \$1 billion in military outlays can only be evaluated properly if you first start by observing that it was a cut in a projected \$4.1 billion increase in military spending. The cut came out of a lot of fat, whereas the cut in health, education and welfare, and domestic services, came close to the bone and gristle. The second point to be made about the military cuts is that they represent no real overhaul of the bloated military budget. Robert S. Benson, former aid to the Pentagon Comptroller, recently showed (in the March issue of *The Washington Monthly*) how easily \$9 billion could be cut out of military spending without impairing national security. But the three main "economies" cited by the Nixon backgrounders are sleight-of-hand. One is "lower consumption of ammunition in Vietnam". This looks optimistic in view of the enemy offensive and our own search-and-destroy missions; as in other years, this may be one of those preliminary under-estimates which turn up later in a supplemental request for funds. The second "saving" comes out of the shift from Sentinel to Safeguard, but the reduction in fiscal 1970 will be at the expense of larger ultimate costs. Indeed while the Nixon estimates show that Safeguard will ultimately cost \$1.5 billion more, McGraw Hill's authoritative DMS, Inc., service for the aerospace industry puts the final cost \$4.3 billion higher, or a total of \$11 billion without cost overruns (which DMS expects). The third "economy" cited is \$326 million saved (as a *Washington Post* editorial noted tartly April 3) by "postponing procurement of a bomber missile (SRAM) that doesn't yet work." Like all else in the Nixon Administration, the budget revisions represents feeble compromises which give the military machine priority over the growing urban, racial and student crises.

May 15, 1969

CONCERNING THE NOMINATION OF  
OTTO F. OTEPKA

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week the Senate Judiciary Committee, by a vote of 10 to 3, voted to recommend confirmation of Otto F. Otepka as a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board. In recent weeks press accounts have sought to link the former State Department security officer with certain organizations and individuals, as a result of which a set of six questions was presented to the chairman of the Judiciary Committee for further inquiry. The questions and the subsequent replies are part of the hearings on the nomination of Otto F. Otepka, which documents are on sale at the Government Printing Office at nominal cost.

I request that the questions relating to the nomination of Otto F. Otepka and the responses submitted thereto be inserted in the Record at this point:

NOMINATION OF OTTO F. OTEPKA, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., May 5, 1969.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,  
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary,  
U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with the discussions at the Committee meeting last week, we believe that before the Committee takes up the nomination of Otto Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board, there should be included in the printed record information relating to the recent questions raised about Mr. Otepka's finances and connections. In particular we suggest that the staff obtain from Mr. Otepka, and from independent inquiry if necessary, the facts on the following subjects:

1. Mr. Otepka's source of income, other than his State Department salary, since 1961.

2. The precise sources and amounts of financing for Mr. Otepka's legal fees, living expenses, traveling expenses, and other expenses since 1961.

3. Any formal or informal connections between Mr. Otepka and (1) Mr. Willis Carto, (2) the John Birch Society, (3) the Liberty Lobby, or (4) any other persons or organizations actively associated with Mr. Carto, the Society or the Lobby.

4. The accuracy of a report that Mr. Otepka stated in response to questions about his associations: "I am not going to discuss the ideological orientation of anyone I am associated with"; and, if the report is accurate, Mr. Otepka's opinion as to the applicability of a similar standard to others being considered for federal employment or otherwise under inquiry in connection with security matters.

5. Mr. Otepka's opinion as to the possibility that individuals and groups of the type generally described as "radical right" or individuals or groups generally described as "Nazi" might under certain circumstances constitute a threat to domestic security.

6. The extent to which the issues raised in the preceding questions were investigated and considered in the course of the Executive Branch's pre-nomination procedures regarding Mr. Otepka.

We are confident that all the members of the Committee join us in feeling that fairness to the nominee and to the public re-

quires that these matters, which have been raised publicly, be aired and resolved within the Committee before it passes on the nomination. We are hopeful also that Mr. Otepka will feel free to take this opportunity to make any further comments he wishes regarding the office to which he has been nominated and his suitability for it.

Sincerely,

EDWARD M. KENNEDY.  
QUENTIN BURDICK.  
JOSEPH D. TYDINGS.  
PHILIP A. HART.

MEMORANDUM

MAY 9, 1969.

To: Senator Eastland.

From: J. G. Sourwine.

Subject: Inquiries of Senators Hart, Kennedy, Burdick, and Tydings respecting finances and connections of Otto Otepka.

In compliance with your instructions the staff has obtained from Mr. Otepka, and from independent inquiry as necessary, the facts called for by the questions propounded.

The questions are repeated below seriatim, and the facts obtained by the staff with respect to the subject matter of each question are set forth, immediately thereafter.

1. Mr. Otepka's source of income, other than his State Department salary, since 1961.

Since 1961, Mr. Otepka has had income, other than his State Department salary, only from the following sources: (A) interest on savings accounts and stock dividends; (B) wife's salary as a school teacher (from 1965 only); (C) daughter's salary (during 1968 only); (D) director's fees (family corporation); (E) sum received by wife in 1966 by gift and devise from her aunt.

2. The precise sources and amounts of financing for Mr. Otepka's legal fees, living expenses, traveling expenses, and other expenses since 1961.

LEGAL EXPENSE

Total legal expense incurred in connection with Mr. Otepka's case has amounted to \$26,135, of which \$25,127 represented legal fees and \$1,008 represented reimbursement of cash disbursement by counsel. These legal expenses have been met by voluntary contributions from more than three thousand different contributors. Most of the contributions were in relatively small amounts, ranging from \$1.00 to \$100.00. Over \$21,000 of this amount was raised by American Defense Fund, organized in 1964 by James Stewart of Wood Dale, Illinois (now living in Palatine, Illinois) in compliance with the laws of the State of Illinois.

Mr. Stewart volunteered his assistance, after having read in the newspapers of Mr. Otepka's intention to pursue fully all of his administrative remedies, and to take his case into the courts, if necessary. Mr. Stewart appears to have made a full accounting for the purpose of complying with State law, and also has filed an accounting with the U.S. Post Office Department.

American Defense Fund has no connection of any kind with the John Birch Society, the Liberty Lobby, or Willis Carto, according to Mr. Stewart, who stated his interest in the Otepka case was sparked by a newspaper article in September 1963, and that in the fall of 1964 he undertook to raise money for Otepka's defense after he learned that contributions from other sources were not meeting the growing legal expenses of the case. Mr. Stewart said he acted as an individual and without any assistance or prompting from any organization.

All contributions forwarded by Mr. Stewart went directly to Mr. Otepka's counsel, Mr. Roger Robb.

The remainder of the legal expense in connection with Otepka's case (between \$4,000 and \$5,000) was paid by voluntary contributions from individuals not associated with American Defense Fund. (Many of these contributions were made in checks mailed di-

rectly to Mr. Otepka's counsel, and checks received by Mr. Otepka personally were turned over by him to his attorney. Mr. Otepka did not cash any such checks, nor receive or retain the proceeds therefrom.) Of these independent contributions, only one was in a very large amount, to wit: a check for \$2,500 received by Otepka's counsel on April 21st, 1964, from Defenders of American Liberties, a non-profit corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois for the purpose of defending civil and human rights. All other independent contributions were in very much smaller amounts.

In an effort to determine the nature of the organization known as Defenders of American Liberties, the Subcommittee staff questioned both Dr. Robert Morris, first president of the organization (who resigned in 1962 to become president of the University of Dallas, and who is now president of the University of Plano) and Mr. J. Fred Schiaffy of Alton, Illinois, who succeeded Dr. Morris. Both Dr. Morris and Mr. Schiaffy denied any personal connection, formal or informal, with the John Birch Society, the Liberty Lobby, or Mr. Willis Carto. One of fourteen persons identified as directors of Defenders is Dr. Clarence Manion, former Dean of Law at the University of Notre Dame, who is reported to have stated he is a member of the John Birch Society. Other directors of Defenders of American Liberties, besides Mr. Schiaffy, are Mr. Roger Follansbee (Chairman of the Board) of Evanston, Illinois; Dr. Edna Fluegel, chairman of the Department of Philosophy at Trinity College, Washington, D.C.; Mr. Lyle Munson, publisher, of Linden, N.J.; Mr. Bartlett Richards, of Florida; General William Wilbur of Highland Park, Illinois; Mrs. Carl Zeiss of Phoenix, Arizona; Mr. Don Tobin, realtor, of Dallas, Texas; Mr. Charles Keating, Jr. of Cincinnati, Ohio; Mr. Norris Nelson of Chicago, Illinois, former publisher of the Calumet (Illinois) News and former assistant director of the Republican National Committee; and Mr. Brent Zeppa of Tyler, Texas. None of these, according to Dr. Morris and Mr. Schiaffy, is known to either of them as a member of or connected with the John Birch Society or the Liberty Lobby.

TRAVELING EXPENSES

Since 1961, Mr. Otepka has made three round trips, by air, to the West Coast, including visits to San Diego and Los Angeles, California, Portland, Oregon, and Seattle, Washington, which trips were not paid for by Mr. Otepka out of his own private funds. Two of these trips were paid for by a number of individual citizens who had no formal group or organization but who had become interested in Mr. Otepka's case as a result of newspaper publicity, and wanted to hear him discuss it. Mr. Otepka talked to these individuals at informal gatherings only, and confined himself to discussion of his own case, avoiding politics or on other matters. At no time did Mr. Otepka accept an honorarium of fee for any speech or talk. The third trip referred to above was sponsored by a formal group, which desired to give Mr. Otepka an award. Because his appearance on this occasion was to be publicly advertised, Mr. Otepka sought and obtained the State Department's approval of this trip before undertaking it.

Total amounts of income (exclusive of his own salary) available to Mr. Otepka and his family during the period in question, which became available for financing his expenses, as indicated above, were as follows:

A. Interest on savings accounts and dividends on stock owned, \$1,711.00.

B. Director's fees (Web Press Engineering, Inc., Addison, Illinois, a family corporation), \$100.00. (This corporation does not have any government contracts whatsoever, and Mr. Otepka does not own any stock in the corporation.)

C. Mrs. Otepka's gross earnings, before taxes, as a teacher employed by the Mont-

May 15, 1969

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — Extensions of Remarks

E 4041

gomery County, (Md.) Board of Education: 1965, \$3,260.00; 1966, \$8,432.00; 1967, \$9,217.00; 1968, \$10,558.00 (Since 1968, when Mr. Otepka first went on leave without pay, his family has had to depend solely upon his wife's salary, and the earnings of his daughter, (referred to below) to meet family living expenses.)

D. Mr. Otepka's daughter was first employed during 1968 and in that year earned

\$765.00 from the Washington Post Company (WTOP-TV) and \$1,189.00 from the D. L. Printing Company, Washington, D.C.

E. By gift and bequest to Mrs. Otepka from her aunt, Mildred Simon, (1966) \$3,400.00.

For ready reference, information on total amounts of income available to the Otepka family during each of the years 1961 to 1968, inclusive, is shown on the chart below.

	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965	1966	1967	1968
Interest from savings.....	101.75	80.00	80	312	23	233.00	309	254
Stock dividends.....	26.88	35.46	42	59	11	24.84	47	72
Director's fees, Web Press Engineering.....								100
Wife's gross income (salary).....					3,260	8,432.00	9,217	10,558
Daughter's gross income (salary).....								1,954
Gift and bequest to wife from aunt.....						3,400.00		
Total.....	128.63	115.46	122	371	3,294	12,089.84	9,573	12,938

8. Any formal or informal connections between Mr. Otepka and (1) Mr. Willis Carto, (2) the John Birch Society, (3) the Liberty Lobby, or (4) any other persons or organizations actively associated with Mr. Carto, the Society or the Lobby.

Mr. Otepka states he does not have and has not had any formal or informal connections with the John Birch Society, or the Liberty Lobby, or Mr. Willis Carto, or with any other persons or organizations known to him to be actively associated with any of the above three. Mr. Otepka has met Mr. Carto, having seen him two or three times, including one occasion on which he lunched with Mr. Carto at the latter's invitation. Nothing was discussed at this luncheon except the legal aspects of Mr. Otepka's case.

9. The accuracy of a report that Mr. Otepka stated in response to questions about his associations, "I am not going to discuss the ideological orientation of anyone I am associated with"; and, if the report is accurate, Mr. Otepka's opinion as to the applicability of a similar standard to others being considered for federal employment or otherwise under inquiry in connection with security matters.

Mr. Otepka states: "This is substantially the tenor of an answer which I gave on two separate occasions to two newspapermen, Mr. Neil Sheehan of the New York Times and Mr. Tim Wheeler of the Daily World, both of whom were, in my judgment, seeking to bait me into making some statement that could be used against me. I would consider such an answer entirely within the bounds of propriety if made by any person under similar questioning by such reporters in like circumstances. On the other hand, in the case of a question regarding either my associations or my associates, asked of me by a representative or official of the U.S. Government having reason and authority to inquire, I should be as fully responsive as my knowledge would permit; and I would expect any other person similarly questioned by authority and with reason to be comparably responsive."

5. Mr. Otepka's opinion as to the possibility that individuals and groups of the type generally described as "radical right" or individuals or groups generally described as "Nazi" might under certain circumstances constitute a threat to domestic security.

"From my general knowledge of history and my 27 years of experience as a security officer, I am acutely aware of the potential dangers to the security of any country from acquisition of excessive influence by totalitarian organizations or individuals of either the right or the left. I would resist with every resource at my command any attempt to establish in this country a Nazi, or Fascist, or Communist government, or any other form of totalitarianism."

6. The extent to which the issues raised in the preceding questions were investigated

and considered in the course of the Executive Branch's prenomination procedures regarding Mr. Otepka.

The staff has been advised by a spokesman for the Executive Branch that Mr. Otepka's nomination followed the usual course, including an investigation by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and a security clearance under the standards of Executive Order 10450.

### BART SUCCESS FORMULA HAS CHIEF CHEMIST

#### HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1969

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, when the residents of the San Francisco Bay area, part of which is within my district, decided in 1962 to invest over three-quarters of a billion dollars to establish the Bay Area Rapid Transit system—BART—the leadership of this huge metropolitan mass transit project was entrusted to Mr. Bill R. Stokes, as general manager.

As such, his job was to oversee the construction of 75 miles of track, a 3.6-mile double track tunnel under the San Francisco Bay, many miles of overhead aerial lines, the acquisition of several thousand parcels of land, the design and procurement of a technologically advanced transit vehicle and control system, and a plan of operation after the construction had been completed.

During this period Mr. Stokes has also had to be concerned with the financing of the entire project when it became apparent that the original funding was insufficient. At the present time, design of the BART system is 93 percent completed and construction is 49 percent finished. About 88 percent of the right-of-way has been acquired and 72 percent of the dollar value of contracts has been awarded. That Bill Stokes has carried out his responsibilities with great success is attested to in an article and editorial which appear in a recent edition of "Railway Age" a national publication of the transportation industry.

It is with great pleasure that I insert at this point in the Record the following material from that magazine recounting the record of achievement of Bill Stokes in this undertaking:

### BART SUCCESS FORMULA HAS CHIEF CHEMIST

Pipe-smoking, genial Bill R. Stokes, general manager of BART, may have an image problem in reverse: He comes on so mild-mannered and agreeable that his critics have to learn the hard way how tough he is.

In 1962, when Bay Area voters approved the \$792-million bond issue that got the BART project started, a few angry citizens brought a tax-payers' suit, alleging BART was an illegal enterprise, and anyway was mismanaged.

In due course, the suit was thrown out of court—chalk up one for Stokes.

The 1964-65 period was taken up with development and testing to make BART the most sophisticated transit system in the world—chalk up two for Stokes.

But the year-long tax-payer's suit had one time-bomb aspect: Precious time was lost during an inflationary period in getting started, and it developed that BART's cost estimates for construction were too low.

The year 1966 may have been the roughest of all: On the one hand, the search for an extra \$150 million began. On the other, Stokes had to contend with a powerful local newspaper which chose this time to launch a series of articles "exposing" BART as a hoax and a boondoggle.

Stokes had two storms to ride out, not one, but he kept his cool. He prepared detailed memoranda for his board and for powerful leaders of all sections of the community, spelling out all his actions and plans—and showed that the newspaper series was concocted of half-truths and hearsay.

The mayor of San Francisco and the community opinion leaders bought Stokes' version, not the other one.

But the ordeal was not over. While construction of BART was already in high gear in the 1967-68 period, there was no guarantee it would be finished unless another \$150 million could be found.

Stokes impressed on the Bay Area delegation to the legislature that this was their fight as well as his, won Gov. Reagan and the state administration to the cause, and emerged a month ago with victory in the form of a state law to raise the needed \$150 million.

An old charge brought against Stokes was that, as a former reporter and public relations man, he lacked administrative experience to run a billion-dollar project such as BART. It's unlikely that charge will ever be brought up again.

### BILL STOKES, WILL YOU PLEASE GIVE CLASSES?

What the transit industry maybe needs is more people like Bill Stokes, general manager of the Bay Area Rapid Transit system. As pointed out in the story on p. 18, BART was threatened with serious financial problems that almost spelled disaster. But the story has a happy ending, thanks to Stokes and his associates.

Even the fact that the BART project can now zoom on to completion isn't the whole story. As important a job as that is, the real significance lies in the lift this will give to the transit industry at large.

The early sixties were times of real anticipation in the transit field, as city officials around the country—with a glance over their shoulders at the Bay Area—started looking at the possibility of building transit systems of their own.

BART's well-publicized financial troubles had a psychological damping effect. What started out as studies for proposed transit systems elsewhere soon became studies of studies—in other words excuses for dragging the feet. A few cities where plans did carry on—Seattle, Los Angeles, Atlanta—saw transit proposals go down to defeat in public referenda on bond issues.

May 15, 1969

No one can say BART was responsible. But the lack of quicker progress in the Bay Area cut the ground from under the feet of transit supporters elsewhere. People can only want what they know, it has been said—and they couldn't very well want something like BART, going by aging test track photos and off-in-the-future artists' conceptions of finished systems. Least of all when they are told that the project isn't going anywhere for lack of funds.

NOW THE PICTURE HAS CHANGED

But with so much of the basic system now taking shape, and with the money assured to complete that system, transit supporters around the country can take heart. One picture is worth a thousand words—and coming BART photos of completed stations, new cars and tracks are worth all of the artists' conceptions in the world, when it comes to promoting the transit idea.

While saluting Stokes for his accomplishment in the Bay Area, it's worth wondering if transit supporters pushing for other systems shouldn't be taking a leaf from his book, when it comes to getting action.

After all, the problems in the Bay Area are not much different from those of any other metropolitan area: Skimpy funds for public works other than highways; lack of public awareness; constantly conflicting policies among planners and politicians. Stokes solved these problems not once but twice; The first time in 1962, when Bay Area voters approved the BART system; the second time just now, when the state of California was induced to provide additional aid to BART.

In both cases, Stokes planned effective strategies to mobilize public opinion, win over lawmakers and influential civic leaders. Maybe Stokes' office on Mission St. in San Francisco should be dubbed BART Test Track II—the place where successful ideas in transit policy got their start.

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON  
VIETNAM

HON. THOMAS J. MESKILL

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1969

Mr. MESKILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today refreshed by the President's first major address on Vietnam. I want to congratulate the President on his candor with the American people. Americans have a right to know what we are fighting for in far-off Southeast Asia. They have a right to know why American boys are dying daily. They have a right to know what our objectives are.

The patience of the American people has been worn thin over the last 8 years because our reasons for being in Vietnam have been wrapped in tired clichés.

Our new President is "telling it like it is." And we can be thankful for that. It is evident that President Nixon has resolved to end the war. It is obvious that he does not seek to raise false hopes only to see them dashed. He did not predict an end to the fighting overnight. He acknowledged that peace would take time in the wake of a war that has dragged on for more than 20 years.

But I am encouraged by the President's statement; it was a constructive step forward in the administration's all-out effort to win a negotiated settlement in Vietnam. The statement was clear, con-

cise, and well organized. It is obvious that some hard thinking and careful analysis went into his report to the American people. He did not dodge the issues, nor did he pull any punches. He faced the issues squarely.

President Nixon spoke of "limited objectives," and then he defined them. This was certainly a refreshing change. He articulated goals and policies that different groups may disagree with or argue over, but I think, on the whole, the American people will respect his forthrightness.

The President clearly stated that our objective is not a battlefield victory. Nor will we accept a unilateral withdrawal or a "disguised defeat."

Our objective is to help develop the kind of environment in which the people of South Vietnam can determine their own political future.

The President, therefore, has cleared up a lot of doubts and erased much of the suspicion over our involvement by stating flatly that we:

First, seek no military bases.

Second, insist on no military ties.

Third, are willing to agree to neutrality if that is what the people of South Vietnam want.

Fourth, are prepared to accept any government if it results from the free choice of the South Vietnamese themselves, and

Fifth, have no objection to reunification if it is accomplished through the free choice of the people of the North and the South.

If the President had said nothing else, he would have made a substantial contribution by simply enunciating these five principles. But President Nixon went further. His speech was noteworthy for its carefully detailed outline of the mechanics for peace, and after all, this is what the hard negotiating will be all about.

The President has called for the "mutual withdrawal of non-South Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam." He has called for a 12-month timetable for withdrawal. He has proposed an international supervisory body. He has called for free elections under international supervision. He has called for an early release of war prisoners. He has urged the observance of the Geneva accords of 1954 and the Laos accords of 1962.

The President has put forth a peace program "generous in its terms." His statement is encouraging for its flexibility and lack of rigidity. He has made clear his willingness to discuss anyone's program for peace. His program was not based on a "take-it-or-leave-it approach." He has made a sincere effort to prevent the United States from getting locked into a policy we cannot live with.

Now much depends on the other side. The United States has spoken its mind with a clear voice. Let us pray that it will not fall on deaf ears. We may not know the effect of the President's speech for weeks or even months. As we have learned over the past 11 months, negotiation is not a speedy process, but it is our best hope. The President has not asked unlimited patience from the American people. He has assumed full responsibility for ending the war and securing

the peace. If he fails, he will not ask for amnesty. It is my fervent hope that the American people will give the President the solid support and encouragement that he will need in the difficult days of negotiation that still lie ahead. For I ask you, what are the alternatives? I fear they are much worse.

A SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LOOKS  
AT THE ABANDONMENT OF JOB  
CORPS CENTERS

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 15, 1969

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as you all know I have been a vigorous supporter of the preservation of the Job Corps program, especially those conservation centers where we are accomplishing so much in the conservation of our natural resources as well as our human resources.

Specifically I feel that abandoning this type of program is going to prove extremely costly to us over the years.

One of the centers to be closed is the Forest Service operated Five-Mile Job Corps Center near Sonora, Calif. Superior Court Judge Ross A. Carkeet, who has been known for many years for his realistic and humane approach to justice, and especially to meet the problems of our youth, has written a very strong presentation in support of retention of the conservation center in Tuolumne County. This was published recently in the "Sierra Lookout," a column of the Sonora Daily Union Democrat. I would like to share with my colleagues Judge Carkeet's views:

I cannot help but voice my feelings about the tragic thing that is happening in our own country—the contemplated closing of the Five-Mile Job Corps.

It is inconceivable that such success in the accomplishment of the avowed purposes of the Job Corps as has been achieved by our local Five-Mile Corps center under the splendid guidance and leadership of Robert (Bob) Royer, should be rewarded by an order from Washington to "shut it down."

With the co-operation of the U.S. Forest Service, under the leadership of Harry Grace, supervisor of Stanislaus forest, the center was built in 1965 and since that time has trained approximately 1,000 youths between the ages of 16 and 21 years.

Much has been written and said about the announced closure, most of it pertaining to the capital expenditure in building and enlarging the center (\$800,000), and much has been said about the trained staff of between 45 and 50 and the loss of such payroll to the county, as well as the funds expended locally each month to keep the center operating.

Much has also been said about the loss to the public of the services of this young group of trainees who have provided conservation and recreational development programs for the benefit of the users of the national forest and which would not otherwise have been provided.

All of these things are true and indeed regrettable from an economic and conservation viewpoint.

I would speak of something more important. In its less than four years of operation the center has given education and